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Meeting Minutes

Date: July 15, 2010

Facilitator: Todd Kalish, Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment

Notes: Tape recording and hand written notes by Nate Winkler, Conservation Resource Alliance

Present:
Ben Bifoss (City of Traverse City)
Steve Largent (Grand Traverse Conservation District)
Nate Winkler, Amy Beyer (Conservation Resource Alliance)
Jim Schramm (Michigan Hydro Relicensing Coalition)
Rick Westerhof (US Fish and Wildlife Service)
Todd Kalish (Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment)
Mark Rollenhagen (Traverse City Light and Power Department)
Becky Ewing (Rotary Camps and Services)
Tom Callison (Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians)
Andy Knott (Watershed Center Grand Traverse Bay)
Mary Gillis (Grand Traverse County Road Commission)
Carl Platz (US Army Corps of Engineers-Detroit District (via conference call))
Dennis Aloia (Grand Traverse County)
Jim Pawloski (Michigan Department of Natural Resources and Environment)

Absent
Brett Fessell (Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians)
1:00-1:05 **Introduction**
Introductions were made around the chambers by those in attendance.

1:05-1:15 **Public Comment**
Todd Kalish opened up the floor to public comment. Mr. Norbert Tutlis, representative of the Boardman River Valley Preservation Society, spoke first. Mr. Tutlis’ comments focused primarily on public comment period protocol and the draft minutes from the prior months meeting not including pertinent information. In addition, Mr. Tutlis questioned the economic analysis of the power generation capacity of the dams, the sequencing of removal, and the potential for increased recreational use of the river and potential negative repercussions.

Mr. Dave Grebner, property owner adjacent to Boardman Pond, spoke in favor of the IT’s work toward removing the dams and indicated that he was looking forward to recreating on the newly restored sections of river.

1:15-1:16 **Additions/deletions to the agenda**
There were no suggested additions or deletions to the agenda.

1:16-1:17 **Review and potential approval of the June 17, 2010 meeting minutes: decision item**
Nate Winkler thanked Norbert Tutlis for indicating the name of the property owner adjacent to Boardman Pond that commented during the last IT meeting’s public comment period. Patty Burke’s comments were recorded but Winkler could not pick her name up off the tape so the draft minutes were recorded with a question mark as a placeholder for Ms. Burke’s name.

There were no suggested additions, deletions, or edits by the IT and subsequently the minutes were considered approved.

1:17-1:20 **Miscellaneous meeting procedural items: discussion/decision item (Todd)**
Todd Kalish asked the IT as a group for recommendations regarding handling the public comment period and the time allocation for each speaker. The general consensus of the IT was to allow speakers to comment for a time period commensurate with the number of speakers total. This is intended to head off any domination of the period by one person.

1:20-1:25 **Army Corps update: discussion (Carl Platz, US Army Corps of Engineers)**
Mr. Carl Platz updated the IT as to the progress made by the Corps’ contractor in producing the 95% Draft Project Management Plan (PMP). The review phase will take this document into the finalization process. Dennis Aloia inquired of Mr. Platz as to the confidence of the Corps’ in the availability of funds for the project as represented in the 95% Draft. Mr. Platz indicated that funding for the project is year-to-year and the timelines in the PMP reflect a contingency with that regard. Mr. Platz indicated that if
funds were to run out, the project would not be able to proceed until additional funding is received. In addition, Mr. Platz indicated with regard to the potential requirement for access to the project sites, “..., however the specific needs, including the extent and location of access, are yet to be determined and will be specified in the project planning documents.”

1:25-1:37 Review of Draft Project Timeline Presentation: discussion (Nate)
Nate Winkler reviewed the power point presentation included in the packet which illustrated the Army Corps’ timeline as described in the 50% draft PMP. The point was made by Winkler that as a draft, the times illustrated were apt to change. Amy Beyer commented favorably on the open dialogue and information transfer provided by the Corps with regard to the project.

Mr. Aloia related to Mr. Platz that the issue came up at a Board meeting discussing the access agreements that may be required as a result of the project so that the site may be accessed to inspect the site. It will be to some extent a requirement of the project according to Mr. Platz.

1:37-1:45 Review of communication timeline: discussion (Nate)
Nate Winkler reviewed the communication timeline and some of the deliverables mentioned therein. Winkler also pulsed the IT with regard to their feelings on allowing the communications working group to do the work of revising deliverables for the communications plan and summarized for discussion at the IT level. The consensus of the group was to continue to do the work at the working group level and bring that work forward to the IT.

1:45-2:10 Review of project manager mid-year deliverables: discussion (Amy)
Amy Beyer reviewed the procedure that was instituted for reviewing the mid-year performance of CRA and the resulting list of deliverables going forward. This includes (as described in the document included in the meeting packet) delivery of a project plan, a communications plan and a fundraising plan. The final aspect of the deliverables is the creation of additional working groups as more and more work is becoming available for them to do.

Dennis Aloia inquired of Todd Kalish when the IT would be provided with a synopsis of Kalish’s review as much of the IT was not included in the work to generate the review. Mr. Aloia continued that he would like to see more specifics in the following year’s contract regarding timelines and deliverables. Mr. Aloia also indicated the desire to see the grant funding described in a way that illustrates how each part fits into the overall project. Ms. Beyer related to the IT at large that it is essential that groups and agencies assist or at least delegate grant administration activities to help with the burden of that administration.
**Action item:** Todd Kalish to distribute midyear consultant agreement to IT per Dennis Aloia's request.

2:10-2:25  **Presentation of fundraising activity report and fundraising updates: discussion (Amy)**  
Amy Beyer reviewed the fundraising activity to date with the regard to the project.  
*Action item:* Steve Largent to forward invasive species grant information to CRA to complete funding table.

2:25-2:26  **Project manager monthly report: discussion (Nate)**  
Nate Winkler asked the IT for comments regarding the monthly project manager report.  
There were no questions or comments regarding the activities described in the report.

2:26-2:28  **Review of project manager quarterly invoice: discussion/decision (Nate)**  
Nate Winkler asked the IT for comments or questions regarding the quarterly invoice included in the packet. Hearing none, the invoice was considered approved.  
*Action item:* Amy Beyer to provide to IT by August 12 a draft scope of work for consultant agreement extension for comment.

2:28-2:35  **Potential IT meeting schedule adjustment: discussion/approval (Todd)**  
Todd Kalish led a discussion regarding the possibility of making the IT meetings every other month until there were substantial items to consider. The new schedule will begin subsequent to the September meeting (cancelling October and December) and was approved by general consensus of the IT.  
*Action item:* Nate Winkler to distribute a revised meeting schedule to the IT as well as the City and County for public posting. In addition, distribute for public posting the first Friday of the month “Project Managers” working meetings in CRA’s boardroom.

2:35-2:40  **Agenda items for the next meeting and meeting review-discussion/decision item**  
There were no suggestions from the group for agenda items for the next meeting.

2:40-3:00  **Public comment**  
There were no members of the public that indicted the desire to comment.

3:00  **Meeting Adjourned**